

The University of Chicago

IMPERIALISM IN THE
VIEWS AND POLICIES OF LEADING
EUROPEAN STATESMEN, 1875-90

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE
SOCIAL SCIENCES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
1942

By
FRED LATIMER HADSEL

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
1945

The University of Chicago

IMPERIALISM IN THE
VIEWS AND POLICIES OF LEADING
EUROPEAN STATESMEN, 1875-90

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE
SOCIAL SCIENCES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
1942

By
FRED LATIMER HADSEL

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
1945



IMPERIALISM IN THE VIEWS AND POLICIES OF LEADING EUROPEAN STATESMEN, 1875-90

I.

This study deals with the views and policy of imperialism held by the leading statesmen of Great Britain, France, Germany and Italy during the period from 1875 to 1890. The career of each political leader is outlined in terms of his connection with colonial expansion; and his general political policy is related to his attitude toward imperialism. Since the views of a statesman were frequently similar to those held in other countries, there tended to be patterns of argument for or against imperialism which were European in scope. A survey of these ideas constitutes the final part of this analysis.

During the period from 1875 to 1890 the term "imperialism" had different shades of meaning, and more recently liberal, socialist, communist and other interpretations have made it still more ambiguous. In this study "imperialism" connotes the extension of political control to overseas territory. It is synonymous with colonial expansion, but it also includes the establishment of protectorates, which were not full-fledged colonies but nevertheless involved political action. "Nationalism" is another word which abounds in different meanings. In this study it denotes an attitude which puts the power and wealth of a country above the welfare of any particular group within it and above the rights and claims of other powers. A "nationalistic" conception of imperialism embodies the elements of extreme patriotism and emphasizes power and prestige above economic advantages or individual benefits.

The years 1875 and 1890 represent approximate rather than strictly accurate limits of the early period of modern imperialism. Great Britain was the first to revive an interest in overseas expansion which was under way by the middle of the seventies. The defeat of France in 1870 started a chain of events which led the Third Republic to entertain imperialistic ambitions before the decade was over, since by means of overseas expansion many of

its leaders envisaged a method of regaining her former position among the powers of Europe. The unification of Germany and Italy brought about a concentration of political and economic power which soon sought outlets in various overseas enterprises, but not until the eighties did these nations actually undertake the acquisition of colonial territories.

The end of this period is likewise indefinite. In Germany the fall of Bismarck in 1890 and the negotiation of the Anglo-German treaty concerning Africa and Heligoland in the same year sharply marked an era. The conclusion of agreements concerning Abyssinia and Somaliland between 1889 and 1891, and the fall of the Crispi cabinet in the latter year, brought to a close a similar period in Italy. Great Britain consolidated most of her colonial claims in a series of treaties between 1889 and 1891, so that the resignation of the Salisbury ministry the following spring was also a terminating point. The year 1890, however, did not see a profound change in the trend of French expansion. Here the date fell in the middle of a gradual shift from the indifference of the previous years toward a renewal of colonial interests in the nineties. The years 1875 and 1890, like those limiting any period in history are not satisfactory from all points of view, but they provide an adequate framework in which to consider the development of imperialism.

The criterion employed in determining who were the "leading statesmen" is both flexible and arbitrary. The essential characteristic is that the statesman was a prominent member of the government in power or the leader of an influential parliamentary party. The more important of these qualifications is the holding of a ministerial portfolio, but if this were used alone it would eliminate many outstanding politicians who held significant views of imperialism. The second qualification provides for those other parliamentary leaders who played a leading role in the development of colonial expansion.

In the case of Great Britain the five statesmen selected as the most important--Benjamin Disraeli (Earl of Beaconsfield), W. E. Gladstone, Lord Granville, Lord Derby, and Lord Salisbury--were all cabinet ministers and in some manner responsible for the conduct of foreign affairs. The six additional parliamentary leaders discussed--Lord Carnarvon, Lord Hartington, Lord Rosebery, W. E. Forster, Sir Charles Dilke, and Joseph Chamberlain--were

likewise influential and also held ministerial positions. In France only four of the seven leaders chosen held cabinet posts during the expansionist era; they were W. H. Waddington, Jules Ferry, Léon Gambetta, and Charles de Freycinet. Each of these men was at one time or other President of the Council and Minister of Foreign Affairs, and more than any of their contemporaries they played a predominant part in the imperialist movement. Two of the statesmen--Albert de Broglie and Georges Clemenceau--belonged to the opposition throughout this period; the former was spokesman of the extreme Right, while the latter wielded influence as leader of the extreme Left. They personified those groups which criticized colonial expansion in France. Of the German statesmen only Prince Bismarck actually dealt with imperialism as a minister of state. The others--Wilhelm von Kardorff, Rudolf von Bennigsen, Adolf Woermann, Ludwig Windthorst, Ludwig Bamberger, and Eugen Richter--were leaders of important political parties in the Reichstag, and as such either supported or attacked the Chancellor's colonial policy. All seven of the Italian political leaders held ministerial positions during these years. Three of them, however--Marco Minghetti, the Marquis of Visconti-Venosta, and Benedetto Cairoli--were in the opposition during the height of expansion; Agostino Depretis, Pasquale Mancini, Count Nicolis di Robilant, and Francesco Crispi all conducted the foreign affairs of the kingdom at some time between 1882 and 1890.

The connection of a statesman's concept of imperialism with political action on the other hand and contemporaneous thought on the other is especially significant for this study. Since the leader had the power--either to promote or oppose an expansionistic program--his ideas formed a link between the actual execution of a given policy and the general political, economic, and social trends of the times. His view of colonial expansion generally contained little originality. Instead, he was a broker of ideas; he gathered them from the prevailing thought and formed from them his own particular synthesis. In this he was influenced by his personal attitude, the necessities of a parliamentary situation, and what he conceived to be the wishes of those on whom he was dependent for power.

The views of imperialism held by European statesmen did more than merely reflect current thought. There were many groups which had an interest in distant parts of the world but which

were not necessarily advocates of colonial expansion. However, when a political leader combined the doctrines of these organizations with his own views of expansion, he tapped a new source of support for his actions. The approval of these various groups was thus secured in behalf of a program with which originally they had had little connection. For example, there was nothing innate in the gospel of the missionaries which demanded conquest. In the course of events, however, this group became an ally of the imperialists and the political leader formed a conception of colonial expansion as a Christian force. In this fashion the views of the statesmen played a unique role in the course of colonial expansion.

The interplay of forces did not end there. In the process of formulating his views of imperialism, the political leader lent strength to those very elements from which he had drawn his doctrines. Thus the agitation in behalf of protective tariffs was itself strengthened by the application of its arguments to colonial expansion. In a similar manner, overseas commerce was aided as colonies were acquired for the purpose of protecting trade. Likewise, the spread of Christianity received an impetus in its own right by virtue of the place it held in the views and policies of the statesmen of Europe.

II.

Great Britain

British colonial expansion experienced a marked revival in the mid-seventies. The acquisition of the Fiji Islands in 1874, the purchase of the Suez Canal shares in 1875, the passage of the Royal Titles Bill in 1876, the annexation of South Africa in 1877, and the occupation of Cyprus in 1878 all indicated a sharp reaction to the antipathy toward the Empire and colonial expansion which had characterized the previous decades.

The complexity of the causes for this change indicate how widespread the new movement was. The rising competition in trade with continental firms induced the merchant and manufacturing groups in Britain to reconsider the economic value of the colonies. The concept of the Empire as an outlet for industrial products, a source of raw materials, and a region for capital investment assumed a new importance, and eventually produced a sentiment

in favor of acquiring new territories. Missionary and anti-slavery societies supported overseas expansion as aiding the propagation of their doctrines. Colonial agents also contributed to this revival. Frequently forcing the hand of the government at home, these empire builders were instrumental in determining the course of the actual events. Their policies, moreover, frequently brought on competition with other powers. The resulting international rivalry stimulated colonial expansion on the part of the British government which found its previous monopoly challenged by the newcomers.

Between 1875 and 1892 there occurred a gradual shift in the interests and activities of British expansionists. During the early years of this period their attention was concentrated on the Near and Middle East, where they secured Cyprus in 1878, intervened in Afghanistan from 1878 to 1880, and occupied Egypt in 1882. Thereafter the rest of Africa and the Far East became more important. Successive conquests were made in Basutoland, Bechuanaland, Rhodesia, East Africa, Zanzibar, and West Africa. In the South Sea area, British control was confirmed over parts of New Guinea, Borneo, the New Hebrides and New Caledonia. The result of all this activity was to secure for Britain a new empire which was larger than that acquired by any of her competitors.

Benjamin Disraeli (first Earl of Beaconsfield) was leader of the Conservatives and Prime Minister from 1874 to 1880. His conservatism was strong yet flexible. It emphasized the traditions of the Crown, Church, and Empire, but it also sanctioned electoral reform and social legislation. He had a genius for distinguishing between lost and living causes, and in reviving an interest in the Empire he sensed the coming tide of colonial expansion. Disraeli's main concern was to consolidate and strengthen the existing Empire. His conception of colonial expansion was therefore subordinated to this policy. He considered the conquest of new territory desirable when it assured the strategic position of Britain's dependencies or raised the prestige of the government. He did not develop an elaborate view of expansion as an economic asset or as a means of fulfilling a civilizing mission. Neither did he espouse a doctrine of racial superiority. He was a forerunner of the renewed imperialism; as a result his conceptions were not as detailed as those of his successors.

William Ewart Gladstone held office in various British

ministries for over half a century. By the sixties he had emerged as the great champion of Liberalism, and he remained true to its principles of public economy, moderate reform, and free trade throughout his life. As Prime Minister from 1880 to 1885 he personified the "anti-imperialism" of the times. Gladstone was not opposed to the retention of the existing Empire; he was, however, critical of colonial expansion. The cost of administering the dependencies was in his eyes already too great; the expense of further conquest would, he thought, impose an unbearable load upon the English tax-payer. As the diplomatic obligations of Britain were already heavy, he deplored the increase in such responsibilities which new colonies would entail. An extension of British influence also meant a drain upon manpower which would leave the Empire in a weakened condition in case of attack. The moral arguments against expansion, however, weighed most heavily in his mind, and he sharply attacked any acquisition which was contrary to the will of the natives. Gladstone modified his policy when he came to power, for he was obligated by the commitments of his predecessors and his own ministry was split over the issue of expansion. For example, he was induced to agree to the occupation of Egypt and the conquest of Bechuanaland, even though he could never completely reconcile them with his point of view. His term of office represented the last stand of the older Liberalism against a policy which appealed to many members of both political parties.

Lord Granville held the post of Foreign Secretary in Gladstone's ministries from 1870 to 1874 and from 1880 to 1885. As a Liberal he had earlier shown little interest in colonial expansion. During his second term of power his policy was inconsistent. On the one hand he favored withdrawal from the Transvaal and Afghanistan; on the other, he approved expansion in Egypt and South Africa. In his conceptions of imperialism Granville was never doctrinaire. His views shifted with his actions, and consequently he made pronouncements which sometimes defended and at other times attacked colonial expansion. He was an "anti-imperialist" in his criticism of conquest as costly and strategically disadvantageous. He was an expansionist in his justification of other conquests as an extension of British civilization and an improvement of the local administration. Under the pressure of international rivalry, he was impelled to advocate the acquisi-

tion of new colonies in order to forestall other powers. Between 1880 and 1885 Granville's views were frequently identical with those of Gladstone, but he proved more pliable in the face of pressure than the Prime Minister. While his chief stubbornly fought against colonial expansion, Granville lacked the necessary moral fervor for such a position. Instead, he shifted as a weathercock before the wishes of parliament.

Lord Derby was Foreign Secretary in Disraeli's ministry from 1874 to 1878 and Colonial Secretary in that of Gladstone from 1882 to 1885. Originally a prominent Conservative, Derby refused to follow Disraeli's aggressive Near Eastern policy and resigned office; thereafter he gradually shifted his allegiance to the Liberals. The dominant characteristic of Derby's temperament was caution; it prevented him from executing an adventurous policy and from evolving a comprehensive theory of colonial expansion. Derby was an "anti-imperialist" in the sense that he protested against an expansion of the Empire. Such action he regarded as an unwelcome expense and a heavy burden on the people. In place of this he proposed to spend the money on improving the conditions of the masses in England. The government had no duty to civilize the native of Africa, he declared, nor had it any right to impose a control contrary to the wishes of the local inhabitants. Like Gladstone, however, Derby was goaded into supporting colonial expansion during 1884 and 1885, when he attempted to forestall the ambitions of German imperialists. He nevertheless remained convinced that such actions were detrimental to the true welfare of the existing British Empire.

Lord Salisbury directed the foreign affairs of the British Empire during the height of the expansionist period. Foreign Secretary in Disraeli's ministry from 1878 to 1880, he pursued an aggressive policy in the Near and Middle East. Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary from 1887 to 1892, Salisbury brought to a successful conclusion a series of agreements which protected British interests throughout Africa. As the most imperialistic of the five leading statesmen, Salisbury held comprehensive views of expansion. He was fully cognizant of the value of protecting English business venture and assisted them in extending their influence. He was likewise a proponent of colonial expansion for humanitarian reasons--in order to eliminate the slave traffic in Africa and to aid the spread of Christianity. The keynote to

Salisbury's conception of imperialism, however, was his nationalism. For example, he held intervention into Afghanistan to be necessary to protect the prestige of the British flag in India, and he undertook extensive conquests in Africa in order to forestall the ambition of other powers. Colonial expansion in his eyes was part of a world policy of assuring the strength and power of Great Britain.

Other parliamentary leaders were of particular significance in the expansionist movement. Lord Carnarvon, Colonial Secretary at the time of the annexation of the Transvaal in 1877, was both a proponent of imperial federation and of the civilizing mission of Britain. Lord Hartington and Lord Rosebery held similar views, although neither developed them to the extent of the other leaders. A Liberal colleague of these two last men was W. E. Forster, one of the first important statesmen to propose a federation of the Empire as a means of strengthening its bonds and enhancing its power. He likewise supported colonial expansion as part of a civilizing mission. Sir Charles Dilke developed the most theoretical conception of colonial expansion of any of these parliamentarians. Not only did he believe in the duty of Great Britain to extend her civilization, but he propounded a doctrine of racial superiority which gave this duty an additional appeal. Joseph Chamberlain likewise believed in Anglo-Saxon superiority. Moreover, he consciously combined his extreme liberalism in domestic politics with an obligation to improve the lot of peoples elsewhere, and thereby developed what he himself termed "radical imperialism."

France

The renaissance of French imperialism came a few years later than the British, since the first years of the Third Republic were characterized by "recueillement." This preoccupation with domestic and continental issues persisted until 1878, when the French Foreign Minister secured the assent of Britain to the eventual occupation of Tunis. At the same time the government was concerned with Egypt, in which the Anglo-French condominium controlled the financial administration. By the early eighties the colonial expansion was in full swing, and during its brief period of ascendancy in French policy, a new empire was added to the overseas possessions of the Republic.

The causes of this revival of imperialism were in some respects analogous to those in Britain. Traders extended their spheres of interests throughout the world, while other business firms increased the amount of French investments abroad. Explorers penetrated the depths of the Dark Continent, while at home publicists aroused an interest in colonial development. The colonial officials were in the vanguard of the expansionist movement, and they took advantage of the situation to extend French control wherever possible. Within the country, moreover, there was a strong sentiment among the statesmen that colonial expansion would in part compensate for the defeat at the hands of Germany and the loss of Alsace-Lorraine; hence these leaders favored imperialism in order to rebuild French world power.

Between 1881 and 1885 the tempo of French imperialism was greatly accelerated. The conquest of Tunisia took place in 1881, and its complete control was assured during the next two years. Expansion in Equatorial Africa had begun in the seventies; it culminated in 1885, when France obtained sanction for her claims in treaties negotiated at the Conference of Berlin. The extension of control throughout West Africa proceeded at a less spectacular pace during these years; it consisted in gradually bringing the hinterland of Senegal under the French flag. In Madagascar a treaty of protectorate was concluded in 1885, after two years of hostilities with the natives. The same period saw the denouement of expansion in Tonking, where armed intervention began in 1883 and was finally able to bring the region under French control two years later. By 1886, however, a trend back to an occupation with domestic and continental affairs occurred in the policy of the French government, and colonial expansion thereafter proceeded at a slower pace until its second revival ten years later.

William-Henry Waddington was Foreign Minister and then President of the Council from 1877 to 1879. A moderate yet confirmed republican, he guided French policy during its first steps in the new imperialism. Although he did not elaborate his views of colonial expansion, he made certain elements of his thought clear. He believed that the acquisition of new territories would benefit the economic condition of France by providing places for the export of capital. Conquest was also justified as upholding the prestige of France in half-civilized parts of the world. The core of his thought, however, was his doctrine of compensation.

The Republic, he declared, could not follow a policy of withdrawal in colonial areas without losing completely its world position. The acquisition of outlying territories, moreover, would redress the balance of power in favor of France. It would thus compensate for the defeat of 1870.

Jules Ferry was Foreign Minister and President of the Council intermittently from 1880 to 1885. As the outstanding imperialist among the French statesmen, he was instrumental in the acquisition of Tunisia, Tonking, Madagascar, and Equatorial Africa. As a republican he personified those influences which were in the vanguard of the expansionist movement. Ferry developed an all-inclusive conception of imperialism. In his eyes it was the necessary child of industrialism and the corollary of high tariffs, for colonies created and protected markets for the manufactured products of France. He also viewed colonial conquest as safeguarding the heritage of the past for the use of future generations. In this connection he insisted upon protecting treaty rights and investments that had been made in outlying regions, and he also viewed as a sacred obligation the duty to maintain intact the existing Empire. In order to do either of these he frequently undertook a policy of colonial expansion. Ferry expounded an elaborate doctrine of the civilizing mission of France, whereby he gave a moral sanction to the right of imposing a superior culture on the natives of a conquered region. Political considerations, however, took precedence over other elements in his views of imperialism. Strategic necessity, for example, frequently played a large role in his support of conquest. The competition of other powers with France, likewise, influenced his policies and his point of view. Finally, the confidence that by means of colonial expansion France could regain the place in world affairs to which she had a right was deep-seated in his mind. These economic, humanitarian, and political aspects of Ferry's views were more carefully expounded than those of any other French statesman. Both the scope of his actions and the comprehensiveness of his ideas thus placed him ahead of his colleagues.

In contrast to Ferry, Léon Gambetta played a minor role in the actual course of colonial expansion. He was, however, one of the most important figures of the Republic. As President of the Council and Minister of Foreign Affairs in the winter of 1881-82, he continued the expansionist policy of his predecessors.

Gambetta's views of imperialism were fragmentary, since his pre-occupation with the issue came as something of a postscript to his political career. He favored colonial expansion for the benefit of trade and industry; he was zealous in his protection of French rights and interests overseas; and he held a lofty view of the civilizing mission of the Republic. Most important in his attitude, however, was the application he made of his nationalism to imperialism. Gambetta viewed colonial expansion as part of the French tradition and as a necessary prerequisite to a reassumption of world power. It was on that basis primarily that he took his place among the imperialists.

Charles de Freycinet was an example of a stability in the personnel of French cabinets even though they were of short duration. Between 1878 and 1893 he was a member in ten different ministries, during which his terms as Foreign Minister came at the height of the period of imperialism. Freycinet followed a policy of qualified expansion, for parliamentary considerations and continental diplomacy dominated his actions. In thought, however, he was more of an expansionist. He emphasized the protection of treaty rights and financial interests abroad, and made such views a reason for colonial conquest. He stressed a doctrine of the continuity of obligations from one cabinet to another, and thereby justified his own policy by what his predecessors had undertaken. Freycinet also expounded a theory of the civilizing mission of France. Although at times he espoused extreme views of colonial expansion, he was always a cautious politician. Neither his statements nor his actions were consistently imperialistic, and he was influential in redirecting the emphasis of French foreign policy toward continental affairs after 1886.

Albert, Duke of Broglie, led the monarchist opposition to the Republic. Representing those forces which were Catholic and conservative, he fought the anti-clerical and liberal tendencies of the cabinets from 1877 to 1885. His opposition to imperialism was conditioned by his general political policy; his views on expansion therefore represented a mixture of positive ideas and parliamentary tactics. Although most of his criticisms of colonial conquest were negative in character, there were two which were positive. Broglie insisted, first of all, that colonial expansion was detrimental to the position of France on the continent of Europe. Not only did the dispersal of manpower hurt the country

from a strategic standpoint, but the involvements which were incurred in overseas conquest damaged her diplomatic situation as well. Underlying this attitude was Broglie's second point. He considered the Republic too weak and vacillating to carry out a consistent policy of imperialism. He thus admitted that colonial expansion itself was not necessarily to be criticized, but rather he believed that the Republic was by its nature prevented from undertaking successfully such a course of action. In contrast, he desired "recueillement," i. e. withdrawal from entangling engagements and concentration upon domestic and continental problems.

Georges Clemenceau led the radical opposition in the Chamber of Deputies during the period of colonial expansion. In this he was traveling the same political path as the Duke of Broglie--in fact the two groups which these men led often co-operated--but in the long run the views of the extreme republicans were completely incompatible with those of the monarchists. In addition to the negative criticism in which every opponent of expansion engaged, Clemenceau matched the arguments of the imperialists with counterpropositions. Thus he declared that the acquisition of colonies was economically unsound. Not only was it frequently undertaken merely to protect speculators but it entailed a heavy tax burden without helping the common people. The funds should instead be used to improve the living conditions of the masses. The increase in tariffs which accompanied the expansion, moreover, defeated its own purpose. Instead of providing new markets it dried up those existing within France by raising the cost of living. Clemenceau likewise denied that France had a civilizing mission which justified conquest; the claims of superiority which this doctrine implied were, he asserted, in opposition to the true spirit of republicanism. Imperialism, furthermore, was contrary to the political welfare of the Republic. Strategically it weakened the country by its drain upon the armed forces; diplomatically it resulted in involving the nation abroad when it should concentrate on continental problems. In place of expansion, Clemenceau expounded the idea of "recueillement" in order that the Republic might first consolidate its strength at home and then face Germany without having wasted her energies at the four corners of the world.

Germany

German colonial expansion was inaugurated in 1884 with all the enthusiasm of pent-up energy. For over a decade the government had steadfastly refused to undertake overseas conquest, but finally the forces in favor of imperialism became strong enough to reverse this established policy. Explorers and commercial agents investigated parts of Africa and the Pacific islands; stations for trade with the natives were established, and the value of outlying territories was recognized. Missionaries undertook to spread their gospel in these regions, and colonial and religious societies at home aroused interest in the colonies. Especially important in Germany imperialism were the economic factors. The demand for new markets and raw materials impelled many firms to engage in overseas enterprise; as a result colonial conquest secured support from influential groups of the country. Likewise, the agitation for protective tariffs lent strength to the expansionist movement, since colonies were considered as necessary to a self-subsistence system of economy. A final factor was the attitude of Bismarck himself, who decided that his previous methods of protecting German interests abroad would have to be modified.

Once the colonial expansion got under way in 1884, it proceeded at a rapid pace, and by 1890 Germany had obtained an extensive empire. In Equatorial Africa the colonial agents edged the Brits out of the Cameroons; likewise, they secured territory in Togoland which their rivals had intended to claim. In East Africa, however, the German agents were the most active, and there they also succeeded in acquiring vast new territories. German interests in the South Seas were traditionally connected with the Fiji Islands, but after their acquisition by Britain, the Germans bestirred themselves elsewhere. They obtained part of New Guinea and the neighboring Bismarck Archipelago, as well as the Marshall Islands.

Since Bismarck had for many years refused to support colonial expansion, his change of policy came as a surprise to the other powers. The reason behind this new attitude was his conclusion that territorial control was essential to a successful world trade. Although he was not insensible to other values of colonies, the most important of his conceptions of imperialism

were economic in their nature. German traders needed new markets; German industries needed raw materials. Colonies which could fulfill these wants were considered valuable in his eyes. After a system of protective tariffs had been adopted, moreover, Bismarck recognized that the acquisition of territories in which no hostile duties could be raised would be a benefit to the commerce of the nation. The intentions of his policy were symbolized in his effort to turn the colonies over to the chartered companies and to limit the extension of actual political control to a supervision of these agencies. At the same time Bismarck was conscious of the imponderable elements in imperialism. He insisted that German citizens must be protected and the flag respected; he likewise supported expansion as an aid to the missionary and civilizing forces of the nation. Bismarck's view of imperialism, however, was limited; he was not chauvinistic in his conceptions.

Wilhelm von Kardorff supported the Chancellor's imperialistic policy wholeheartedly. As leader of the German Imperial Party, Kardorff played an important role in the Reichstag during the years of colonial expansions. His outlook was above all national; he believed in a harmony of interests within the state which worked for the benefit of the whole. Consequently, his arguments for imperialism reflected this point of view. In order that Germany might achieve the position in world politics which her strength and her talents warranted, he argued that she must possess a colonial empire. His economic reasoning in favor of expansion was tinged with the same ideas. As an early advocate of protective tariffs, he had held that the entire country would benefit from them, and he viewed colonies as a necessary corollary of this system of economy. He also favored the acquisition of overseas territories in order to obtain the necessary raw materials and to secure the desirable market which such a system of tariffs demanded. Finally Kardorff had great confidence in the ability of the German people to transmit their civilization to native tribes, and to this end he made eloquent appeals in behalf of colonial expansion. Kardorff's represented a strong but not blatant nationalism.

Rudolf von Bennigsen and Adolf Woermann were prominent members of the National Liberal Party, which during the eighties rejected free trade and adhered to Bismarck's economic policy. The former was leader of the party, while the latter took the pre-

dominant part in the discussions over colonies. Bennigsen's arguments were echoes of those of the Chancellor; Woermann's, on the other hand, were of more importance.

The economic outlook which characterized Woermann's attitude was based directly on his interest as head of a large trading firm in Africa and as a representative of the merchant classes. His position was simple: the acquisition of colonies would aid commerce; commerce benefited the entire nation; the government should therefore acquire overseas territories. The prosperity which colonies brought extended to all groups of the people, he insisted, and the markets they provided was an assurance of opportunities which the German merchant did not have elsewhere. Woermann was conscious of other advantages of imperialism. He spoke of the civilizing mission which lay before the country in acquiring African territory, and, more practically, he stressed the competition among the nations, in which Germany had to take part or fall behind the others in wealth and power.

The imperialism of Ludwig Windthorst was more qualified than that of the National Liberals. As leader of the Catholic Party he had waged war with Bismarck throughout the seventies; when the Chancellor offered peace with the Church in return for support of his other policies, Windthorst always made his approval conditional. Until late in the eighties he was critical of the expansionist policy. He deplored the cost and doubted if it would bring satisfactory results. He disliked adventurous diplomacy and feared that a dispersal of forces would weaken the strength of Germany on the continent. When the Catholics became seriously interested in the suppression of slavery and the extension of missions in Africa, Windthorst realized the civilizing possibilities of imperialism. He thereupon changed his attitude and supported Bismarck's imperialism. Concern for the humanitarian aspects of colonial expansion was always his preoccupation, and he therefore did not elaborate other kinds of views.

Ludwig Bamberger represented the political philosophy which failed to gain an ascendancy in Germany at the time of the revolutions of 1848. Liberal in his general outlook and laissez-faire in his economics, he was a staunch opponent of Bismarck after the Chancellor inaugurated the system of protective tariffs. As a member of the liberal opposition Bamberger was also highly critical of Bismarck's colonial policy. The conquest of colonies,

he declared, was a costly chimera--expensive in the burden it placed on the taxpayers and self-defeating in its purpose. Overseas territories will have no value, he insisted, in a world of free trade. Markets will be accessible to all, as will be raw materials, and the possession of colonial regions will be useless. This attitude, indeed, was the heart of Bamberger's thought. At the same time he deplored the chauvinism which accompanied overseas conquest, for he was tolerant himself and disliked such an extreme attitude.

Eugen Richter was an even more constant critic of Bismarck than Bamberger. As leader of the Progressive Party, he had attacked the government's conservatism ever since he entered the Reichstag. He opposed colonial expansion as costly and dangerous, since it increased the tax burden of the people and drew the nation into conflict with other powers. Richter also deprecated the moral consequences of imperialism, for he believed that the brandy and ammunition which the traders sold brought degradation and war to the native tribes. More important than these reasons for his condemnation of expansionism were those which sprang directly from his liberalism. He denied the correctness of the theory of the self-sufficiency of a nation, for he was a free trader; hence he believed that the doctrines which justified the acquisition of colonies for markets and materials was fallacious. The intervention in private enterprise which the artificial stimulation of colonial expansion represented was anathema to Richter. His principles as well as his personal antagonism to Bismarck therefore make him an opponent of imperialism.

Italy

The causes of the colonial expansion of Italy were in some ways like those of other powers, but as she possessed less commercial and political power than the other imperialistic nations, she did not achieve similar results. Discussion over the possibility of establishing a penal colony had raised interest in overseas territories. The obvious need for alleviating the pressure of surplus population encouraged similar tendencies. The commercial expansion and the recognized necessity for state-aid to the merchant marine stimulated inquiries as to the value of colonies for economic purposes. Finally, the example of other colonial powers and the desire to assume a place of importance in

European politics were of importance in the inception of colonial expansion.

After a timid start in 1882, the Italian government undertook the conquest of the east coast of the Red Sea in 1885. Interest in the venture lagged until two years later, when the government was galvanized into action by the massacre of a column of soldiers not far from Massaua. During the succeeding ministry of Francesco Crispi (1887-1891) expansion south on the Abyssinian plateau was undertaken which culminated in the defeat of the native emperor and the establishment of protectorate over his territory. At the same time efforts were being made in Somaliland, where during these years Crispi managed to acquire rights of suzerainty over the coast from the tip of East Africa southwards to the British possessions.

The critics of imperialism on the Right, Marco Minghetti and the Marquis of Visconti-Venosta, were not hostile to all colonial expansion. The former roundly condemned the government for having failed to accept the British offer to intervene in Egypt in 1882, while the latter envisaged a certain amount of overseas conquest as Italian compensation for the British occupation of Cyprus and the French acquisition of Tunis. As leaders in the cabinets which dominated the early history of a unified history, they preferred a modest foreign policy, one devoted to maintaining the status quo. These two men criticized method first of all; they held that the policy of the government was inept and short-sighted. Secondly they questioned whether Italy, which was as yet weak in armed strength, should risk endangering her very existence by an adventurous overseas policy. While they admitted that commercial expansion was legitimate, they opposed the risk and expense involved in more aggressive action. Continental considerations thus dominated their thoughts. Their attitude, however, was almost entirely negative; they did not elaborate a program which would serve as a substitute for imperialism.

Benedetto Cairoli made his reputation as a leader of the Risorgimento; he lost much of it, however, by his inept conduct of foreign affairs. President of the Council and Foreign Minister intermittently between 1878 and 1882, Cairoli was unfortunately in power when Italy returned empty-handed from the Congress of Berlin and sought unsuccessfully to prevent the French conquest of Tunisia. Cairoli was thereafter in the opposition. He fa-

vored commercial expansion and supported efforts to increase Italian influence in Tunisia; at the same time, he disclaimed any desires for conquest. During the early efforts to found a colony on the coast of the Red Sea he remained skeptical of the government's policy. He was nevertheless induced to support the occupation of Massaua and the strengthening of Italian influence in that region in order that the honor of the country be restored after the massacre of Italian citizens. Cairoli undoubtedly had a sincere concern for the good name of Italy, but he lacked either the interest or the ability to formulate a clear conception of Italian policy overseas.

Agostino Depretis dominated the Italian cabinets from 1881 to 1887. His preëminent desire to remain in power brought down on him the blame for inaugurating "trasformismo," whereby the political parties disintegrated in the face of the desire for individual gain. Although the movement was greater than Depretis, he was undoubtedly its most immediate beneficiary, for he held office through a number of different cabinets. His concern for imperialism was intermittent. The first time he took over the portfolio of foreign affairs (1885) he expounded a policy of commercial expansion and of modest territorial conquest. The second time he held this position (1887) he actively extended Italian control in the hinterland of Massaua, and strongly advocated imperialism. The expansion of influence was necessary, he held, not only for the safety of Italian troops at Massaua but in order to secure peace and order for the continuance of commerce in that region. Since foreign affairs were never his major preoccupation, Depretis' views were not carefully elaborated. What statements that are available, moreover, indicate that domestic issues caused him to change his mind between 1885 and 1887. He did not hold a consistent view of imperialism.

Pasquale Mancini was the most eloquent of Italian imperialists. He held the post of Foreign Minister from 1881 to 1885 and hence directed the attention of the expansionists to the coast of the Red Sea. A moderate in domestic politics, as were the other advocates of expansion among Italian leaders, Mancini made a more brilliant reputation as professor and student of international law than he did as foreign minister of the realm. On the one hand he refused the British invitation to aid in the occupation of Egypt, and on the other he took the decisive steps of assuming

sovereignty over Assab and of sending the expedition to Massaua. At first Mancini looked upon the growth of Italian influence on the coast of the Red Sea as a commercial enterprise of establishing connections with the interior of Africa. Another of his arguments in behalf of imperialism was a doctrine of the civilizing mission of Italy. Likewise important in his statements was a fear that another power might precede Italy in taking over that region. Finally he regarded the expansion as compensation for the failure to intervene in Egypt three years earlier. At the same time, Mancini never completely abandoned his preference for a limited expansion, which, he hoped, would achieve these various goals without endangering the diplomatic position of the country in Europe.

Count Robilant entered the Italian Cabinet late in his life and remained in power as Foreign Minister for only two years (1885-1887), yet he played a decisive role in improving the diplomatic position of his government. Taking advantage of the crisis over the unification of Bulgaria and the Franco-German friction, Robilant renewed the Triple Alliance with Austria and Germany on more favorable terms by providing for support of eventual occupation of Tripoli. He likewise provided, by the agreements of 1887, against change of the status quo in the Mediterranean without the consent of Italy. His preoccupation with continental affairs precluded a deep interest in colonial expansion. He regarded it chiefly in terms of the compensation it might provide for any change in the balance of power in the Mediterranean region. At the same time he was not opposed to the Red Sea venture once it got under way, but since he regarded it as a luxury in Italian foreign policy he never formulated elaborate conceptions as to its value. His assertion that the Massauan expedition was one of a civilizing mission, for example, did not mean that he considered the enterprise of fundamental importance.

Francesco Crispi was Italy's leading imperialist of the period. After a stormy career he became President of the Council and Minister of Foreign Affairs from 1887 to 1891. Not only did he direct the extension of Italian influence in Abyssinia and Somaliland, but he evolved an extreme doctrine of colonial expansion. Economic views of imperialism did not interest Crispi seriously, although he did speak in terms of the commercial future of Eritrea. The most important part of his conception of expan-

sion was nationalistic. Crispi desired above all to secure a place for Italy among the great powers that was comparable to her ambitions. He regarded the expansion of Italian influence in East Africa as one aspect of this program. Thus he believed that colonies were necessary to the life of a modern state, that they enhanced its prestige, and gave it weight in the councils of Europe. Less inclined than some of his colleagues to speak in terms of a civilizing mission, Crispi viewed imperialism as an element in power politics, and except for this one point he did not develop detailed arguments to support his policy.

CONCLUSION

Up to this point imperialism has been discussed with reference to certain countries and their leading statesmen. There is, however, another aspect of the problem, for the movement had characteristics common to all four colonial powers. What was happening in one country was being emulated in another; what a leader asserted in one parliament was being echoed elsewhere. The course of colonial expansion and the views of the various leaders assumed certain patterns which contained much that was peculiar to a particular nation or statesman but which also showed how thoroughly the movement was European in its scope.

The majority of the leading European statesmen favored colonial expansion.¹ The minority was split into two groups: those who consistently opposed expansion and those who were equivocal in their position.² From the standpoint of their contribution to the conception of imperialism, the members of this third group were the least important. Either they exhibited such a disparity between statements and actions as to present no coherent picture of their attitude, or they were so cautious as to conceal any general views they may have held.

European Aspects of Colonial Expansion

To a great extent the same causes of colonial expansion were present in all four nations. This was certainly true of the

¹Any division of this nature must to a certain extent be arbitrary, since the policy of these statesmen varied from time to time. During the height of expansion in their various countries, these men were imperialists: Britain--Carnarvon, Chamberlain, Dilke, Disraeli, Forster, Hartington, Rosebery, and Salisbury; France--Ferry, Gambetta, and Waddington; Germany--Bennigsen, Bismarck, Kardorff, and Woermann; Italy--Mancini and Crispi.

²Those statesmen generally opposed to imperialism were: Britain--Derby and Gladstone; France--Broglie and Clemenceau; Germany--Bamberger and Richter; Italy--Minghetti and Visconti-Venosta. Those who were equivocal were: Britain--Granville; France--Freycinet; Germany--Windthorst; Italy--Cairolì, Depretis, and Robilant.

factors. The rapid industrialization which had first taken place in Great Britain was in process in France, Germany, and Italy. While Britain far out-distanced her continental rivals, this difference was relatively unimportant as far as imperialism was concerned. Many British realized that they would soon no longer be able to dominate the European market; they were therefore led to reevaluate their overseas markets and to revive colonial expansion. From the beginning the continental industrialists had to face serious competition even within their own country; they were therefore forced to search abroad for markets, in which they otherwise might not have been interested. Another factor was the depression in the level of prices during the late seventies and the eighties, which made investments within Europe less attractive. This encouraged the tendency to send capital abroad and increased the financial stake of European nationals in outlying territories.

The desire in Europe for markets and opportunities for investment, however, played less of a role in the early years of colonial expansion than did the agents of trading firms in the overseas territories. For example, German merchants preceded territorial expansion on the west coast of Africa. French traders led in the conquest of Annam, while French investment companies prepared the way for the occupation of Tunisia. An Italian firm purchased Assab. British mining companies led expansion in South Africa, while chartered companies (such as the one in North Borneo) were laying the foundation for conquest elsewhere in the world. All of these enterprises were concerned with protecting and expanding an economic interest in an outlying region; in that capacity they appealed for an extension of the political authority of their home government to new areas.

During the eighties the protectionist agitation made headway in all four of the colonial powers, and without exception it was allied with expansionism. In France, for example, tariff revision was enacted for the colonies in order to strengthen the Republic's economic power, and in the Chamber imperialists and protectionists were closely allied. Likewise in Germany, except for the Prussian agriculturists, the groups favoring high tariffs also sponsored expansion. Similarly, Crispi embarked his country on a tariff war with France in order to modify the low commercial treaties, and at the same time he led the most imperialistic of the Italian cabinets. Even in England there was an analogous

movement. The Fair-Trade League favored moderate protection on the one hand and contributed to the colonial expansion movement on the other.

The initial work of exploring hitherto unknown territories was undertaken by men from all the powers. Such early leaders as the German Karl Peters, the Italian Gustavo Bianchi, the Frenchman Savorgan de Brazza, and the British David Livingstone, all obtained a response that was as European in scope as any other aspect of imperialism.

Likewise, each of the European powers had its organizations for the propagation of colonialism. Whether one met with the Royal Colonial Institute in London, the Geographical Society in Paris, the Colonial Association in Berlin, or the Society for Commercial Exploration in Milan, the problems discussed, the papers read, and the interests represented were to a large extent similar. The concomitant publications which spread an interest in expansionism varied among the four nations in intensity and degree of efficacy, but their general emphasis was much the same.

The missionaries added their strength to the current of imperialism throughout Europe. The British groups were the first Protestants in the field during the early nineteenth century. Soon afterwards German societies were also active in Africa and the Far East. Cardinal Lavigerie organized the White Fathers for the spread of Christianity and civilization in French Africa, while the Italian Catholics established themselves in Somaliland and Abyssinian regions. In each of the principal colonial powers the activities of these groups developed an interest in colonies among a portion of the population which knew little about economic expansion and power politics but which approved colonial expansion for religious reasons.

Still more significant an impetus was given to expansion by the colonial officials, who were generally more imperialistic than their home governments. For example, the annexation of Annam, the acquisition of Zululand, the conquest of German East Africa and the expansion inland from Massaua were all advocated by the officials on the spot long before the cabinet at home adopted a favorable attitude. While the various governments at first repudiated the policies of these men, they were later constrained to carry them out.

All these various factors contributed to the rivalry

among the powers for outlying territories. This competition not only took place in the colonial areas but also the policies of the governments themselves. Each nation was induced to make acquisitions in order to prevent that particular region from falling into the hands of another country. This rivalry contributed to the increasing tempo that characterized imperialism in these years.

Colonial expansion held a similar relationship to the general foreign policy of all four nations. With the exception of Great Britain, imperialism played a minor role in European diplomacy. No country was willing to jeopardize its continental position in order to satisfy the ambitions of its expansionists. Although British policy combined imperial and continental considerations more than did that of other powers, it did not as a rule allow its overseas activities to control its actions towards continental powers.

Each of the four countries went through a cycle of colonial development. It was marked first by the temporary accession to power of a modest majority in favor of imperialism, followed in its next stage by a sharp increase in the strength of this group, and finally by a shift of attention back to continental and domestic affairs. Thus German expansion first became a parliamentary issue in 1880, got under way in 1884, and temporarily lost its strength in 1890. French imperialism revived in 1878, went through a period of intensive activity from 1881 to 1885, and then died down for almost ten years. The Italian government took the first official steps in 1882, entered fully into the scramble for African territory in 1884, and paused in its efforts in 1891. British expansion, inherently more complex, renewed itself in the seventies, suffered a temporary set-back between 1880 and 1882, and then developed until the African agreements of 1889-1891. In each of the countries, moreover, the concluding points did not mark a genuine withdrawal from colonial expansion, but rather they signalized a short breathing period for the final struggle of the nineties.

European Aspects of the Imperialistic Point of View

The similarities in the colonial expansion of the various powers carried over into the views of the political leaders. Despite the differences which individual preference and national

policy introduced, the economic, humanitarian and political aspects of the concept of imperialism were likewise international in their scope.

The economic aspect of colonial expansion was considered by almost all of the imperialistic statesmen. Political intervention in a region was frequently considered necessary in order to protect established interests--investment in the local potentate's bonds, speculative enterprises in real estate, or land and property acquired for the use of European residents.³ Nominally the purpose was to reestablish the status quo, although in reality the Western power usually found itself induced to secure further rights and advantages in order to protect those which had already been acquired.⁴

Almost all of the expansionist statesmen--and even many of those who were equivocal in their attitude--took the point of view that conquest contributed to the commerce of their nationals. This attitude, as distinguished from the protection of rights and interests, was frankly acquisitive. Whether in the center of Africa, Asia, or the South Sea region, European political leaders recognized the advantages that would accrue to trade if their particular government were to dominate that region.⁵ In some instances this point of view explicitly claimed that trade followed the flag; in other cases, such an opinion was merely implied.

The advocacy of colonial expansion in order to acquire markets was more than an immediate interest in commerce. Statesmen also envisaged the acquisition of a region in order to secure a reserve for the future sale of products manufactured in their own country.⁶ Frequently these views assisted the agitation for high tariffs in the new territory, and as such they formed part of the general protectionist movement which was currently gaining

³Granville, Salisbury, Waddington, Ferry, Gambetta, Freycinet.

⁴English intervention in Egypt and French intervention in Annam are extreme examples in point.

⁵Disraeli, Salisbury, Freycinet, Bismarck, Woermann, Minghetti, Cairoli, Depretis, Mancini, Robilant, Crispi.

⁶Ferry, Gambetta, Bismarck, Kardorff, Mancini.

strength.⁷ In other cases the hope of obtaining sources of raw materials played an important part in their attitude.⁸ Closely allied to these opinions was the confidence that new colonies would provide new outlets for the export of capital.⁹ Such a possibility was recognized by implication by a larger number of leaders than actually formulated it as a doctrine.

The most abstract of the economic arguments was that which insisted that colonial expansion was a necessary corollary of industrialism and was therefore essential to the general prosperity of the nation.¹⁰ Since few of the statesmen evolved a theory of expansion, not many of them explicitly elaborated this view of expansion. Such an attitude, however, was implied throughout the other economic doctrines which were expounded in favor of imperialism.

The differences among the statesmen who held economic conceptions of imperialism may be explained primarily in terms of the nature of the expansion within each country. The overseas establishments of Italy were modest; her stake in colonies was small, and she could not hope for immediate returns from what she did control. Economic reasons for overseas expansion therefore played a minor role in the statements of her imperialists. The leaders of those powers which already had large overseas interests--Britain and France--naturally employed to the greatest extent arguments involving protection of established rights and interests. Similarly those nations most influenced by the protectionist agitation--Germany and France--made greater use of the conception of colonies as reserves for a future development of markets. The advocacy of expansion for the export of capital was the most popular with French statesmen, since they were faced with the necessity of justifying colonial expansion when there was no need for emigration. In Germany, where the industrialization was the most rapid during these years, the demand for markets and raw materials

⁷Particularly was this true in the thought of Ferry, Bismarck, and Kardorff.

⁸Bismarck, Woermann.

⁹Waddington, Ferry, Bismarck, Woermann.

¹⁰Ferry, Gambetta, Kardorff, Bennigsen, Woermann.

was made with the greatest frequency. There the growing industries felt the need of stable sources of supply and assured outlets for products more acutely than did the older enterprises in Britain and the more slowly expanding companies in France. The desire to increase commerce was, however, common to all the nations.

The superiority of European culture was universally assumed by the imperialists and its dissemination was regarded as a legitimate reason for colonial expansion. The elements which contributed to this attitude were found in almost every phase of life. The astounding scientific progress of the era gave people a sense of power, as was sometimes brutally shown in the superiority of their fire-arms over native weapons. The faith which characterized an evangelical Christianity took for granted the desirability of converting the heathen. The commercial and political expansion of European countries during the previous centuries was considered proof of the higher calibre of Western culture.

In view of the prevalence of this confidence, it was natural that European statesmen should appeal to a civilizing mission in support of their imperialistic program. Almost all of the expansionists paid their respects to this doctrine.¹¹ Only rarely was it challenged, even by the opponents of imperialism. Since this point of view was so much taken for granted, however, it was rarely carefully elaborated and frequently was open to vague and conflicting interpretations. Each leader, moreover, tended to identify civilization with the policy of his own individual country, and practically no one considered the humanitarian aspects of the movement in a European light. In those instances when the doctrine of a civilizing mission was given a precise formulation it usually one of three forms. First of all, there was the insistence that the extension of political control over a region would bring it good government, financial stability, peace, and order. Secondly, the acquisition of native territories was held to be necessary as a means of suppressing slavery. Finally, colonial expansion was sometimes viewed in terms of its assistance

¹¹Nineteen of the leading statesmen made a special point of this attitude. Disraeli, Gladstone, Granville, Salisbury, Carnarvon, Hartington, Rosebery, Forster, Dilke, Chamberlain, Ferry, Freycinet, Bismarck, Kardorff, Woermann, Visconti-Venosta, Mancini, Robilant, Crispi.

to missionary activity.

The doctrine of a civilizing mission embodied both rights and obligations. The superior culture was justified, it was held, in enforcing a better administration on the natives, since its very superiority involved an obligation to share these benefits with other people. It was among the statesmen of Britain and France--countries which had the longest tradition of colonial experience--that this doctrine was most fully elaborated. English expansion on the periphery of India, French expansion in Tunisia, Tonking, and Madagascar, and joint intervention in Egypt were instances in which this point of view was emphasized.¹² The French were inclined to lay stress on the value of imposing their civilization on the native regions directly, while the British tended to endorse a doctrine of trusteeship.¹³ The latter attitude coupled with it a liberalism which was absent from continental views.¹⁴ Among the Germans and the Italians this doctrine did receive during these years an equal elaboration.

The suppression of slavery was one of the important tenets of the doctrine of a civilizing mission. All of the powers adhered to this point of view--as shown by the General Acts of the Berlin and Brussels Conferences. In a general form the anti-slavery agitation had little influence on this expansionism since it was also approved by the opponents of imperialism. When, however, this movement set itself the task of eliminating the traffic in Africa, it joined forces with those groups who sought territorial expansion. Thus British and Italian statesmen proposed to extend the influence of their countries in the Sudan in order to suppress the slave trade, and British and German statesmen viewed their imperialism in East and Equatorial Africa in the same light.¹⁵ French leaders, however, were less interested in the agitation, although they participated in the general conferences for this purpose. Despite the concern of a few Italians for this task

¹²Gladstone, Granville, Salisbury, Ferry, Freycinet.

¹³This became a central theme of Carnarvon, Dilke, and Chamberlain.

¹⁴Particularly in the thought of Dilke and Chamberlain.

¹⁵Hartington, Salisbury, Bennigsen, Windthorst, Mancini.

most of them were indifferent to its appeal. The impetus for the suppression of slavery in these latter countries did not come until the end of the period under consideration, when Cardinal Lavigerie secured the papal blessing for his campaign against the evil.¹⁶ As there were no strong anti-slavery societies in either of these countries during the early eighties, the pressure of these interests was not yet great upon the political leaders, and they were not disposed to endorse the movement.

Closely related to the anti-slavery agitation and the doctrine of a civilizing mission was the development and spread of missionary activity. Only a few of the European statesmen, however, directly linked the expansion of missions with that of political influence. The most specific in their remarks were the German statesmen.¹⁷ British and French political leaders espoused the same ideas more indirectly. The protection of property rights was to a large extent the defense of missionary stations; hence both in Africa and the Far East, the safeguarding of these interests by these latter statesmen was partly religious in purpose.¹⁸ Since in Italy the overseas missionary movement was as yet not strong, her political leaders did not discuss the matter at any length.

Pronounced variations may be noted in the doctrine of a civilizing mission. The British alone elaborated a theory of racial supremacy.¹⁹ The French placed their faith in the value of their culture. On the other hand, the more extreme of the imperialists denied that the principles of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity could be applied to native populations, since these people could not yet appreciate them.²⁰ The closeness of this

¹⁶In 1888 Leo XIII gave his special blessing to the movement.

¹⁷Bismarck, Windthorst.

¹⁸A particularly clear case was the French policy in upholding the land rights and protecting the lives of missionaries in Madagascar; Freycinet.

¹⁹Rosebery, Dilke, Chamberlain.

²⁰Ferry.

theory to one of racial supremacy is evident, but no French statesman of this period explicitly elaborated such a point of view. The Italian concept contained fewer humanitarian elements. Italy's future in Africa was viewed primarily in terms of international prestige, while the contributions of her civilization were not carefully elaborated. Among the German politicians, the Catholics were the chief exponents of a civilizing mission, since they identified the missionary movement with colonial expansion.²¹

The political conception of imperialism was more complicated and at the same time more nearly universal than were its economics and humanitarian counterparts. Among the British and French statesmen there developed a series of views all posited on the maintenance of established rights and interests. From the beginning the insistence on treaty rights was a central theme of the expansionists who supported the French intervention in Tonking, the Anglo-French condominium in Egypt, the French activity in Madagascar, and, later in the eighties, the German and Italian ambitions in East Africa.²² This idea was also expressed in the policy of protecting the lives of European nationals--whether on the banks of the Nile, the Congo, the Zambesi, or the Red River of Tonking. This point of view became the reason for numerous expeditions throughout the world, and while it was frequently economic in its importance, it was also political in its insistence upon respect for an individual because of his nationality.²³

The sanctity of treaty rights and the protection of Europeans were both phases of the more general conception that colonial expansion was necessary in order to safeguard and pass on to posterity the patrimony of the nation. In Britain this sentiment found its expression in the reaction against "anti-imperialism" and in the movement to tighten the bonds of the Empire.²⁴ One outcome of this attitude was expansion of power in the Mediterranean and Middle East; another was the effort to bring about

²¹Windthorst.

²²Ferry, Freycinet, Waddington, Woermann.

²³Waddington, Bismarck, Kardorff, Woermann. This point of view was closely linked to the maintenance of national prestige.

²⁴Disraeli, Salisbury, Carnarvon, Forster.

confederation in South Africa. In France this same attitude was personified in the doctrine of "conservation," whereby the statesman owed an obligation to future generations to safeguard the Empire. He frequently made this duty an argument for expansion as well as for the maintenance of those colonies already in the country's possession.²⁵ The Germans and Italians did not set forth these ideas, since as yet they had very little to conserve.

Another facet of the political conception of imperialism emphasized strategic considerations. The necessity of controlling fortified points throughout the world had been a tenet of British thought for many decades, and during this period it entered into the reasons for intervening in Afghanistan and the Sudan.²⁶ The desire to prevent Italy from dominating the straits of Malta and securing a foothold in northern Africa was important in the minds of the French statesmen who ordered the occupation of Tunisia.²⁷ In order to obtain protection against the attacks of native tribes, the Italians urged the acquisition of the hinterland of Massaua.²⁸ Since the colonial expansion of Germany did not involve military action on any scale, these points were not stressed by her statesmen.

One of the points most frequently stressed by imperialists was the need of maintaining prestige. It usually took one of two forms. Either the expansion was held necessary to restore directly respect for the European nation in a given locality, or such action was considered essential to uphold the good name of the power elsewhere. British statesmen invoked this argument with increasing frequency after the passage of the Royal Titles Bill in 1876. The intervention in Afghanistan, for example, was conceived as a means of maintaining the influence of the British flag in India and the East.²⁹ The French statesmen uttered similar views in upholding their policy in Tunisia, Egypt, Tonking, and Madagascar.³⁰ After the massacre of their troops, the Italian leaders insisted

²⁵Ferry, Freycinet.

²⁶Disraeli, Salisbury.

²⁷Waddington, Ferry, Gambetta.

²⁸Depretis, Crispi. ²⁹Salisbury.

³⁰Waddington, Ferry, Gambetta, Freycinet.

that their flag could not be insulted by barbarians without proper redress.³¹ The Germans likewise stressed this consideration in their expansion in East Africa.³² Prestige as an imperialistic concept was much like the doctrine of a civilizing mission. Both were so vague as to take on many interpretations and become catch-alls for arguments of dubious sincerity. An appeal to the honor of the flag, like an appeal to the destiny of a people, lent itself to demagoguery. The effectiveness of the appeal to prestige illustrated the hold which such views had upon the imagination of the statesmen and the people. The conception did not have to be concrete to be persuasive, and it was as important a reason for expansion as was economic gain or power politics.

As universally employed as the argument of prestige, but more concrete in its expression, was the view that colonial expansion was necessary to prevent another power from occupying the territory. In Great Britain even those statesmen who were generally opposed to expansion were induced to accede to such a policy because of this factor,³³ and such a point of view was at the heart of the thought of her leading expansionists. International competition loomed large in the doctrines of French imperialists of all shades. In Egypt, Tunisia, Madagascar, and Tonking the possibility that other powers might edge in was emphasized in their statements.³⁴ The Germans were likewise impressed by this same factor in their policy. Bismarck even felt impelled to conceal his real intentions in the Cameroons in order to forestall British action. Other political leaders in Germany stressed the necessity of staking out claims in Africa immediately or of facing the possibility of being crowded out all together.³⁵ Italian statesmen, having failed in two instances of competition (Tunis and Egypt) were determined that no other power should precede them on the

³¹Cairoli, Depretis, Crispi.

³²Bismarck, Kardorff, Bennigsen, Woermann.

³³Granville, Derby, Salisbury.

³⁴Waddington, Ferry, Gambetta, Freycinet.

³⁵Woermann emphasized this strongly.

coast of the Red Sea; their views consequently expressed a similar attitude.³⁶

The most nationalistic of all the political aspects of expansion was the view that the acquisition of overseas territory would enhance the world power of the country. One of the most significant examples of this attitude was found among the French leaders, who viewed colonial conquest as partial compensation for the loss of Alsace-Lorraine and the defeat at the hands of Germany.³⁷ They went further than that, however, for they also considered expansion as a general enhancement of French influence abroad. Some of the German imperialists held ideas surprisingly similar to those of their neighbor to the west. They believed that unless Germany engaged in overseas expansion, she would be unable to take the place among world powers to which her talents and strength entitled her.³⁸ While there was as yet no doctrine of racial superiority or an explicit claim to a "place in the sun," the views that colonies were essential to power had already been frequently stated. The Italian version of this same conception contained elements of both compensation and ambition for power. Even the moderates in Italy recognized that colonies might redress to some extent the loss of position which the acquisition of Cyprus by Britain and of Tunisia by France entailed.³⁹ Other Italian leaders, moreover, were impelled largely by a desire to establish their country in a stronger international position. In this case the expansion was viewed in terms of national power in much the same manner as by the Germans.⁴⁰ This general attitude was expressed in a more indirect fashion in the growth of Imperial Federation League in Great Britain, which proposed to increase the strength of the Empire, without trying the impossible task of subordinating the colonies to the mother country.⁴¹

³⁶Mancini, Robilant, Crispi.

³⁷Waddington, Ferry, Gambetta.

³⁸Kardorff, Woermann.

³⁹Visconti-Venosta, Mancini.

⁴⁰Robilant, Crispi.

⁴¹See Forster's views.

European Aspects of "Anti-Imperialism"

The policy of expansion was attacked by statesmen in all of the colonial powers of Western Europe. This opposition, however, did not come from a homogeneous group, and the diverse elements of which it was composed were frequently able to cooperate with each other only because of the negative quality of their points of view. France presented the clearest example of this situation; there the monarchists and the extreme republicans united against the expansionism of the moderates. Similarly, the opposition in Italy came partly from the Right and partly from the radical and socialist fringe on the Left. To a lesser extent this attitude was also characteristic of the critics of imperialism in Germany; here the Progressives and the Socialists joined hands to attack colonial expansion but differed in general political philosophy. In Great Britain, however, such a situation did not exist, and what little opposition there was to colonies came from the Liberals. Still other national differences were apparent. For example, no bloc of deputies comparable to the French monarchists existed in Britain during the period in question; no faction of the extreme Left like the German socialists appeared in France; no liberal opposition to imperialism existed in Italy comparable to that in Britain. The varieties in the composition and strength of the groups opposing colonial conquest meant that the views expounded frequently differed widely from country to country and statesman to statesman.

Obviously the arguments of an opposition tended to be of a negative nature. Although many of their attacks demolished the imperialist point of view, rarely did the critics venture to propose what should be done of a positive nature in the place of the current expansionist program. There were notable exceptions to this, but they were too few in number to constitute a general pattern of opinion.

The views of the adversaries of imperialism throughout showed less uniformity than those of their opponents. Despite the diversity of the groups opposed to colonial expansion, however, their attacks contained certain common elements. Reasons of general political policy influenced the attitudes of many leaders. This was the case on the continent, where extreme liberals in

Germany, Italy, and France, and monarchists in France were in constant conflict with the cabinet in power.⁴² Personal antagonism also influenced views on expansion, and dislike of the leaders of the government in power carried directly over into the colonial issue.⁴³ Criticisms of details took precedence over other views in the attacks on imperialism. The critics pointed out errors in calculation of the cost, mistakes in the operations in the field, and blunders in the foreign policy of the government.⁴⁴ Still another type of opposition was the claim that the expansionists acted in an unconstitutional manner. The government was accused of two sins: concealing its real intentions and engaging in war without the consent of the parliament.⁴⁵

The constructive elements in the opposition to imperialism generally appeared as counter-propositions to the economic, humanitarian, and political conception of the expansionists.

Condemnation of overseas expeditions because of their expense was a recurring theme of those who criticized imperialism on economic grounds. In Britain such critics held that the cost of administering the Empire was already too heavy; further dependencies would only burden the people more.⁴⁶ Similar arguments were prevalent on the Continent. In France it was held that expansion benefited only a few industrialists but raised the cost of living of the people.⁴⁷ There and in Germany it was likewise asserted that the acquisition of colonies diverted money from needed social reform at home.⁴⁸ In Germany, moreover, there was an explicit connection made between an espousal of free-trade and a denial of the value of colonies.⁴⁹ These points of view current

⁴²Bamberger, Richter, and socialists in Germany; the socialists in Italy; and Clemenceau and Broglie in France.

⁴³The antagonism which the policies of Bismarck, Ferry, Depretis, and Disraeli aroused were outstanding examples of this.

⁴⁴Broglie, Clemenceau, Bamberger, Richter, Minghetti, Cairoli.

⁴⁵Gladstone, Broglie, Clemenceau.

⁴⁶Gladstone.

⁴⁷Clemenceau.

⁴⁸Derby, Clemenceau, Bamberger, Richter.

⁴⁹Bamberger, Richter.

among leading statesmen in France and Germany had not yet attained the support of similar politicians in Italy, where only the republican and socialist fringe of the opposition adopted them.

The humanitarian doctrines which the opponents of expansion marshaled against the policy of their adversaries were remarkably few in comparison to the amount of condemnation subsequently heaped upon Imperialism. The British critics insisted that any new acquisition should be undertaken only with the consent of the local inhabitants.⁵⁰ The theory of self-determination which this point of view represented, however, was not carefully elaborated. A few statesmen expressly denied that European powers had any duty or mission to civilize native populations, but this argument likewise was not widely held or frequently employed.⁵¹ Except for scattered utterances, a concern for the welfare of the natives did not appear to the opponents of imperialism as a satisfactory basis of criticism,⁵² and a questioning of the benefits of Western civilization was never undertaken as a means of denouncing expansion.

Although the political reasons for contesting the value of imperialism were among the most important, they were at the same time the least uniform of those expounded by European statesmen. These views were so closely related to the individual country that they contained few general arguments.

Opponents of expansion throughout Europe considered the movement as endangering the strategic position of the nation. The British regarded further expansion as a drain upon their manpower.⁵³ Those French leaders who concentrated upon revanche considered colonial conquest as a detraction from the main task of strengthening the eastern frontier.⁵⁴ The German critics declared that the obligations which colonies placed upon the navy would weaken the defenses of the northern coast.⁵⁵ Italian leaders emphasized the need of concentrating their strength in the Mediterranean.⁵⁶ In this connection, some of the French and

⁵⁰Gladstone, Derby.

⁵¹Derby, Clemenceau, Richter.

⁵²Richter.

⁵³Gladstone.

⁵⁴Broglie, Clemenceau.

⁵⁵Bamberger, Richter.

⁵⁶Minghetti, Visconti-Venosta, Robilant.

German leaders held that colonial expansion would lead to war, for they feared that the international rivalries resulting from the movement might bring a conflict to Europe itself.⁵⁷

Many of the opponents deplored the diplomatic obligations and difficulties which imperialism entailed. This was particularly true of leaders of the two powers already deeply involved in imperial problems. The French and British statesmen looked with disfavor on the difficulties which new territories would bring to the home government.⁵⁸ Underlying this point of view was the general feeling common to the opponents of expansion in all four countries that the government should concentrate upon problems nearer home. French, German, and Italian opposition leaders expressed this point of view.⁵⁹ At best colonial expansion seemed to them a luxury that they could ill afford. British statesmen, however, did not take this latter attitude but contented themselves with opposing further expansion of the Empire.⁶⁰

None of the leading critics of expansion expounded a theory which was unalterably opposed to colonies. Their point of view was rather that imperialism should be tolerated if it did not endanger the welfare of the country nor involve too great an expense, and if it were desired by the local inhabitants, etc. None of these men condemned commercial expansion; many of them hinted that they would approve colonies as outlets for surplus population. The socialists of Germany and Italy denied the value of imperialism, but these views were not accepted by the dominant leaders. The "anti-imperialism" of European statesmen was directly the outgrowth of specific circumstances; as a result it did not propose a complete condemnation of all colonial expansion.

The Colonial Issue in the Parliaments of Europe

In all four of the colonial powers the issue of colonial expansion was naturally subject to the influences of party politics and parliamentary tactics. In all of these nations, moreover,

⁵⁷Clemenceau, Windthorst, Bamberger, Richter.

⁵⁸Gladstone, Derby, Broglie, Clemenceau.

⁵⁹Broglie, Clemenceau, Bamberger, Richter, Minghetti, Visconti-Venosta.

⁶⁰Gladstone, Derby.

the question was as a rule subordinate to other matters. In Great Britain, the controversy over the acquisition of new territory never exerted a decisive influence on the outcome of elections, although problems of the Empire occupied a larger place in its foreign policy than in that of the continental powers. The discussion did not become a party issue, because members of both groups favored overseas expansion. In France the rise and fall of cabinets was determined almost entirely on the basis of domestic issues. Even the defeat of the Ferry cabinets on their policy in Tunis (1881) and Tonking (1885) was caused by domestic difficulties as much as by questions of overseas policy. In Germany imperialism never dominated the policy of the Chancellor or of the various party leaders. It reflected more than it influenced their attitude on domestic and continental problems. Although in Italy the issue contributed to the fall of the Cairoli cabinet (1881) and the Depretis cabinet (1887), it likewise never received the major attention of the parliament. Throughout Europe the question of colonial expansion exerted less influence on the policies of the various parties than did those of internal politics.

The composition of those parliamentary groups supporting or opposing colonial expansion varied widely from country to country. In Great Britain, the Conservatives were the first to espouse expansionism, but by the mid-eighties a large proportion of the Liberals likewise took up the cause. There was no active opposition on the extreme Right, while the extreme Left was divided on the issue. There were as yet no socialist members to condemn the movement as a manifestation of capitalism. In France the situation was entirely different. The proponents of imperialism were the moderate republicans, for both the monarchists on the Right and the radicals on the Left attacked such a policy. Socialist opposition did not appear until the nineties. The German parliamentary alignments showed still other variations. The conservative factions formed the bulk of support for imperialism, although some of their members remained aloof from the movement. The parties in the middle of the Reichstag (the Catholic Party and the National Liberals) split over the issue. All those to the Left opposed colonial expansion, but of these the socialists were more thorough in their denunciation than the progressives. The groups in the Italian Chamber exhibited fewer sharp alignments than those in other countries. Despite the shifting factions, the

bulk of the support came from deputies in the Center, while in opposition there were conservative, radical, and socialist factions. The transformation of political parties began during these years, which affected all but the socialists. As a result only this latter group presented a solid front against imperialism.

